

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4091

erlinarians has been in effect for several years. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty receive special pay of \$100 a month; those with 2 to 6 years of service receive \$150 monthly; those with 6 to 10 years of service receive \$200 a month, and those with more than 10 years of service receive \$250 a month. Veterinarians receive \$100 of special pay a month, irrespective of their length of service.

If section 5 of the bill were not enacted physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would not receive this special pay, although those officers in these categories who entered on active duty before July 1, 1963, would continue to receive special pay. Since the military services continue to need more officers in these categories, the authority for special pay should be continued.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the bill. The bill is one of the more important items in the legislative program of the Department of Defense this year.

Mr. President, I believe that the committee report on the bill explains each provision of the bill in detail. The program has been operational for a number of years. The extension of the bill is of vital importance for the maintenance of our defense posture as well as to maintain the program of the Department of Defense even for this year. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today the harsh necessities of the cold war require that Congress take action to extend the compulsory draft law for another period. I think all of us are satisfied that the large manpower requirements of our Armed Forces at their present levels of strength require a form of compulsion to encourage enlistments as well as make up any other needed personnel. These are the hard facts of the cold war; our forces are required around the world in varying degrees of hardships and discomfort to combat aggression by a determined foe. Some of them are fighting; all of them are ready to fight. This is the price we must pay to maintain freedom, and this this country is determined to do.

But although we recognize the necessity of this program for induction into the Armed Forces, most of us are not unmindful of the inequities it causes to many of our youth who must carry this burden of defending freedom for all of us. Only around one-half of the young men subject to the draft ever serve a substantial period of military duty. Their contemporaries forge ahead in the competitive race of civilian life. I am satisfied that the various combinations of requirements of the armed services and the exemption policies of the Selective Service System are administered on a fair basis, but these various policies, justified as they may be by other goals of necessity, still result in the overall inequity by which one young man is required to serve while another is not. I know many Senators share my concern that this Nation is not doing enough to redress

this inequity that our national policy places on so many men.

To correct this inequity, 39 of us are cosponsoring S. 5 the cold war GI bill. We hope through this plan to repay in some way the young men who served for the time, effort, and courage demanded of them to defend freedom. We propose educational and training allowances and home loan guarantees for these veterans to help them catch up with their contemporaries who were allowed to stay in civilian life. Almost all of these young men consider it an honor to serve their country, and would be reluctant to insist that the Government owes any special obligation to them, but we who create the inequity by setting the policies do feel the necessity for providing an adequate compensation for their sacrifices.

So as we vote to extend the draft for another 4 years, let it not be said that we are insensitive to the needs of the cold war veteran. It is my expectation to bring to the floor of the Senate this session the cold war GI bill. In this way, before many weeks pass, we can demonstrate to the youth of the country that the draft laws do not operate as an arbitrary capricious roulette wheel which penalizes some but not others. We shall provide adequate recognition and compensation for the burden that our young veterans have carried for all of us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2438) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was necessarily absent from the Chamber earlier in the day when the Draft Extension Act was passed. His staff has asked me to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Oregon, indicating that he desires to be recorded against the extension of the draft. He is necessarily absent, inasmuch as he is joining the President on his trip to Costa Rica.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE IN
OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2438

It is with real regret that I am asking to be recorded against extension of the draft. Had I been present today, instead of on my way to Mexico and Costa Rica, I would have offered a substitute amendment, extending the draft for a 2-year period, rather than for 4 years.

I offered such an amendment in 1959. It was my hope and expectation that during

those 2 years, manpower studies would be undertaken that would produce alternatives to selective service as a means of assuring adequate manpower for the Armed Forces. That year, the congressional critics of the waste of manpower under selective service were "sweet talked" by both the executive branch and the Armed Services Committees with pledges that steps would be taken to review manpower policies. Senator CASE of South Dakota offered an amendment on the Senate floor which I supported, to set up a civilian commission to do this job. We were told that such a commission was not needed, because the Armed Services Committee of the Senate was going to appoint a subcommittee to conduct continuing studies of the utilization of military manpower.

That was sufficient to defeat the 2-year extension, with its proposed manpower study.

So far as I know, that was the end of the matter. If any studies were ever made, their results are not apparent. Not a thing has been done; not a change for the better has been made. Selective service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation. For the injustices it works upon American citizens, the Congress must bear heavy responsibility.

But it is first of all the responsibility of the Pentagon to provide an efficient means of acquiring essential manpower. It is an astonishing thing to me that in a Pentagon building bulging with the so-called whiz kids and slide-ruler minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair method of filling the ranks of the Army.

Why, I ask Mr. McNamara, has not the same attention gone into the human component of your Department that apparently goes into your decisions relating to weapons systems? Does not American industry require efficient use of people just as much as efficient use of machinery, or in this case, of weapons and supplies? Is it possible, Mr. Secretary, that manpower utilization has a low level of priority simply because with the draft in effect, it is possible to bring in however many men are needed without regard to efficiency?

In the last 4 years, I have seen absolutely nothing to restore my confidence that the draft law is really needed. It remains the manpower crutch of the Army alone, not the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The Pentagon can always come to Congress with extensive proof that a substantial pay raise is needed, as it is doing again this year. But where are the studies that will eliminate the criticisms of the inefficient use of drafted men by the Army that were voiced by the Cordiner report and by many other reports?

I submit that I know something about "featherbedding" and "work rules" in industry, and I think it is about time the Secretary of Defense provided some real "work rules" for the Army in the interest of efficiency, as well as in the interest of the young men who are now subject to the lottery of selective service.

Since there is no opportunity to vote for a 2-year extension with a manpower review, I therefore cast my vote against another 4 years of selective service.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senate in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

March 15

4092

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate now returns to the morning hour, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senator from Mississippi recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Is not the Senate in the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, for the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor with the understanding that I will be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Cuba file
WHAT GOES ON?—BAY OF PIGS INCIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the problem of a Soviet military presence in Cuba and what to do about it far outweighs past mistakes and what really happened at the Bay of Pigs. I am also aware of the fact that only the administration can provide the action and the answers required to meet the current threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere. But I certainly do not agree with the administration spokesmen who argue that because we have a danger-fraught situation existing 90 miles off the southern coast of America we must declare a complete moratorium on all discussion of one of the blackest episodes in American history. As I have pointed out before on this floor, it was not the Republicans or the critics of the New Frontier who reopened the public discussion of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—rather, it was reopened by the Attorney General of the United States, who enjoys the unique status of being the President's brother and one of the three men appointed by the President to conduct an official post-mortem on the ill-fated invasion attempt in April of 1961.

Since the Attorney General saw fit to reopen this discussion by providing a selected group of reporters with his personal version, I believe those interested in the full and truthful facts attendant to the Bay of Pigs incident have both the right and the duty to demand an accurate accounting to the public.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will do no good for those in official positions to keep telling us that we should stop talking about the Bay of Pigs or the Cuba story. The reason is—and we have only to look at the daily newspaper to understand this—that the American people will not stop talking about it. And all the exhortations of the Vice President and majority leader will not stop them or the opposition. To them, the administration's supersecret attitude on this official failure has become something in the nature of a "whodunit" which they want solved.

Mr. President, I am again forced to ask "What goes on?" Why cannot the

American people be given a complete, unvarnished version of the events that occurred back in April of 1961? Why must we keep getting the details of those events piecemeal from obscure sources? Why must we go constantly to the newspapers and the magazines for more enlightenment?

In this connection, I recommend to the Senate some required reading. My reference is to an article in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting."

Now, Mr. President, this magazine has had a record of accuracy and consistency in the reporting of emergent facts concerning the Bay of Pigs. And for that reason, I believe some of the statements made in this article should be answered by the administration. They suggest a much heavier American involvement in the Cuban invasion attempt than any of us heretofore have suspected. Some of the disclosures I have never seen before in any official or unofficial statement or any printed versions of the Bay of Pigs episode. For example, let me quote some of the statements made in this article:

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught by chance in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a plane load of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over the American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day of the invasion—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and a copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro's jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American

volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

Mr. President, if this report be true in part or full, I believe the administration owes it to the American people to give us a full and complete rundown on just what occurred at the Bay of Pigs. In light of the Attorney General's insistence that no American air cover was ever planned for the Cuban invaders, it would help to know what, if the report is true, was the meaning of the Navy jets with their insignia painted out? Why was an aircraft carrier standing by with her jets ready, if the report is true? What were the Cuban invaders led to believe about American support? These questions have been begging for answers too long. The American people have a right to know.

I ask unanimous consent to have the U.S. News & World Report article reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BAY OF PIGS: THE CURTAIN IS LIFTING

(NOTE.—That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out. Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.)

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight decks, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack. American combat veterans flew B-26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several were Air National Guardsmen. All were volunteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

How United States helped: These details can now be told.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-Day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4093

get back to the mother ship, standing off-shore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a plane-load of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B-26 pilots hired: On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas, and Virginia, "were offered \$2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B-26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B-26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to were permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

WASHINGTON VOGUE OF PLANNED PERMANENT DEFICITS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, on February 21, the Wall Street Journal contained a very interesting article about the current "Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits." This article points out an interesting fact which many may have overlooked in the present controversy being waged on the Federal level about the budget. That fact is simply this: Considerable importance is still attached on the State and local levels to budget balancing.

No. 41—4

The people more closely connected with the State and local budgets, Mr. President, are the ones who are much closer to the people than any of us here in the Congress of the United States.

This excellent article continues by pointing out, however, that there still is considerable concern in the Congress about the Federal deficit way of life. And I believe there is no Member of Congress more concerned with this present situation than Tom CURTIS, of Missouri, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economics Committee.

Representative CURTIS is a man who is outrightly proud of his Puritan ethics, and he has remained close enough to his constituents in Missouri to know that his people—and people throughout the country—will not be taken in by the New Frontier's so-called new economy talk.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee myself, I can personally attest to the ability and dedication of our conscientious ranking minority member. All of us bow to his knowledge at one time or another, and I deem it a privilege to serve with Representative CURTIS on the Joint Economic Committee. I particularly would commend him on his questioning of witnesses in our recent hearings.

This Wall Street Journal article brings out clearly Mr. CURTIS' opinion about what will happen to the economy and the budget if the administration's plans are followed, as well as other interesting facts so important to all of us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF MINDS AND BUDGETS

A curious thing about the Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits is that it is still not accepted by a number of other governmental entities in managing their own affairs.

No matter how much phoniness may go into some State and local budget-balancing acts, considerable importance is nonetheless attached to the principle. The giants of California and New York, which sometimes seem to be racing each other in spending as well as population, try to keep up the appearance of balanced books. Even New York City does so; an unplanned deficit is regarded as a fiscal crisis.

This suggests that State and local politicians, closer to the people than Washington's "new" economists are, realize the voters wouldn't care for a different policy. The politicians themselves would doubtless feel guilty about deliberately planning big deficits year in and year out. So it is a bit puzzling why what is considered sound policy and politics in certain important governmental units is flouted by the biggest of all.

Actually, plenty of concern can be found in Congress, as in the country, about the Federal deficit way of life. Perhaps as a result, even some administration spokesmen are beginning to sound a little defensive about it—which may or may not be an encouraging sign.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, for one, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the current hope is to achieve a balanced budget in the fiscal period beginning

3 years from this summer. That's a good way off, but at least the man mentioned the possibility.

With that in mind, Mr. Gordon said any tax cuts should be accompanied by efforts to hold down the Government's spending for purposes other than defense and space.

Savings could be made, he indicated, through such means as switching from direct Government loans to private credit whenever possible and generally lowering Government costs and raising efficiency through better management. In addition, of course, the tax cuts themselves are supposed to stimulate the economy so that it will produce much bigger Federal revenues from the lower rates.

If all this is how the Government proposes to balance the budget in some remote future, we fear it adds up to a feeble effort.

Even if some savings attempts were made, and pursued diligently, they could not offset deficits estimated at nearly \$9 billion in this fiscal year and nearly \$12 billion in the next and Heaven knows what thereafter. And the hope of stimulation through tax cuts, which must deepen deficits initially at least, is hardly enhanced by the complexity and lethargic pace of the proposed program.

No wonder Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, told Mr. Gordon he thinks administration economy talk "isn't going to be believed by the people"; the administration's first 3 fiscal years will have seen a spending rise of around \$17 billion. With rising spending and lower taxes, Mr. CURTIS estimated the budget couldn't be balanced until fiscal 1972. For all we know, that may be unduly optimistic.

It certainly can't be balanced until the administration gives convincing proof of abandoning its fetish of deficits of indefinite duration. Almost everybody else in the country knows that running constantly in the red, whether in a family, a business, a local or a national government, is a policy of folly.

As the International Monetary Fund's managing director, Per Jacobsson, put it, the notion that there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

Balancing the budget is necessary not for the sake of appearance but for the sake of the integrity of the Nation's financial foundations. In Washington as elsewhere, integrity is the key to all. It is the key the people and the Congress must persuade the Government to find.

WALTER LIPPMANN TELLS "THE STORY OF THE CONGO"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of bringing to the attention of Senators a most perceptive article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Story of the Congo." The article appeared in the March 4 issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The article should serve to remind us of the trouble past of the Congo as well as of the tremendous efforts which are required in order to put this richly endowed African country on the road to ordered progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking in an entirely different context—and for the purpose of discrediting U.S. policy in Europe—Pravda of

March 11 called Walter Lippmann the "dean of Washington journalism" and conceded that he is a "man who is not customarily given to hyperbole." While rejecting the purpose for which these words are used, I agree wholeheartedly with this apt description of an outstanding American commentator.

The fact is, Mr. President, that in the Newsweek article referred to, Mr. Lippmann has accurately traced the difficulties which beset the Congo immediately following Belgium's grant of independence in 1960. He also makes the very important point that President Eisenhower suggested that Patrice Lumumba turn for assistance to the United Nations rather than rely upon the intervention of American troops to save the Congo from a complete breakdown of law and order. Let those who still question the wisdom of our Congo policy remember that the United Nations has done us the inestimable service of preventing a direct United States-Soviet confrontation in the Congo. It forestalled a situation in which Americans would have performed police functions in the heart of Africa. Either course might have entailed disastrous consequences. In retrospect, as in 1960, I am heartily thankful that the former President of the United States took his wise decision.

Finally, Walter Lippmann gives a brief but telling account of the vital technical and educational services being performed by U.N. and Belgian personnel in the Congo today. We must remember that the Congo today needs first, educated citizens; second, competent and trained administrators; third, engineers and technicians to solve the manifold problems of disrupted or nonexistent public services; fourth, a buoyant economy and a market for the rich natural resources of the country; fifth, and finally, the firmest of links with Western Europe.

In this connection, the Belgians have an all-important role to play. I am pleased to note that they are playing this role—both in their own interests and in the interests of a viable Congo. Not all Belgian businessmen have horns on their heads. Even the mighty Union Miniere is not the archenemy that it was frequently depicted during the Katanga secession. Honesty compels us to recognize that the Congo and Belgium have organic ties which should bind them for years to come. I am glad that Walter Lippmann has indicated the importance of this new relationship between a former colony and its former colonial rulers. I am pleased that he has stressed the role of the U.N. in helping the Congo through the hard days that lie ahead.

EXHIBIT I

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE STORY OF THE CONGO

No one in our time is likely to be happy about the Congo. For it presents a problem which has no quick and obvious solution. What the U.N. has done in the Congo and what the United States has done in the U.N. can be judged properly only if we begin with the basic fact—that the Congo is a large, rich, independent state which is not now prepared to govern itself without outside help.

When people say that the U.N. did not originally contemplate any such large military and technical operation, they are quite right. The authors of the charter in 1945 did not foresee the situation of the Congo in 1960 or what would happen when the old colonial empires were liquidated. There was, as I recall it, a vague assumption that the colonies would be liberated eventually after the imperial rulers had educated them for self-government, as the British had done in India and the Americans in the Philippines. Insofar as any thought was given to the problem, this was to be the model for the liberation of the other colonies.

But in fact the Belgians did not follow that model in the Congo, and the Portuguese are not following it now in what is probably a second Congo—namely, Angola. The controlling fact in the Congo is that it received political independence without adequate preparation.

There was no university in the Congo until 1954, and only a handful of Congolese received European university training. When independence came in 1960 there were only about 30 Congolese university graduates. As late as 1958, only about 18,000 Congolese, out of a population of over 13 million, were attending academic secondary schools. The Belgians prided themselves on the primary and vocational education and the health services of the Congo. It was not an idle boast to say that the Belgian Congo was a showcase colony. But a colony and only a colony it was until the day it was liberated.

Too much, too soon: Naturally we ask ourselves whether independence could not have been delayed. The Belgian Government did not think so. After the riots in Leopoldville in January 1959, the Belgians accepted the idea of eventual independence. Then, under the pressure of the Congolese leaders, Belgium conceded independence for June 30, 1960. This was, of course, much too soon. For there were almost no safety valves, that is to say preparatory steps for independence.

The crucial event occurred 8 days after independence when the uneducated Congolese troops mutinied against their Belgian officers. The mutiny was followed by atrocities, by the flight of Europeans and by the occupation of the key cities by Belgian paratroopers against the wishes of the Central Government. It was in this chaos that the Congo Government appealed to the United States for troops.

President Eisenhower's reply to this appeal was decisive for the whole future. He declined to send American troops and he advised the Congolese to appeal to the United Nations. That is how the U.N. got into the Congo in the first place.

The U.N. was not pushed into the Congo by the Afro-Asian bloc. President Eisenhower did not turn to the U.N. because he was starry-eyed about the U.N. and about the Congo but because the only alternative was American intervention. That, considering all of our other involvements all over the world, would have been, to say the least, imprudent. And to have done nothing would have virtually guaranteed the Russians an invitation to help force out the unwanted Belgians.

The education gap: This background is essential to anyone who wishes to think clearly and fairly about what has been done in the Congo and what will have to be done. The story shows that, with the end of the secession of Katanga, the problem of the Congo is the lack of officials, military officers, technicians, and teachers. Until that lack is made up by the education of the Congolese, which will take at least a generation, many positions in public and private services will have to be filled by outsiders and some authority outside the Congo will have to help maintain law and order.

That is the job which the U.N. and the Belgians have already begun, and it should

go forward rapidly now that the civil war is over. Some 2,000 Congolese are in U.N.-sponsored training programs. The U.N. has provided a thousand foreign teachers and technical experts, and Belgium is giving the services of 2,000 trained people—teachers, doctors, agricultural experts. Altogether 40,000 Belgians are in the Congo, mostly in business, helping to develop the country.

If the U.N. can provide the authority and protection the Congo needs, keeping the services of the foreigners and providing the additional technical help necessary for its development, it will have a success which could not have been achieved by any other authority in the whole world.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of March 13 Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, our representative at the United Nations, appeared before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The chairman of the meeting was the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The meeting was very well attended by members of the full committee.

Adlai Stevenson gave to us a complete and comprehensive report of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the role of our country in that session.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson is one which I think ought to be read by every Member of the Senate. Indeed, the entire transcript of the hearing, which is far more detailed than the prepared statement by the Ambassador, should be "must" reading for every Member of Congress, and for every interested citizen.

Adlai Stevenson described the work of the United Nations in very measured and careful terms, neither exaggerating its importance nor underplaying its significance.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson, particularly as it relates to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations is to my mind very worthwhile reading and of great importance to every Member of the Senate, for we are all concerned about our international relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by Mr. Stevenson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 13, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the United Nations is a big subject—one which can be approached from many points of view. From one point of view it is a symbol of the aspirations of most of humanity for peace, decency, and human dignity. From another point of view it is an institution of 110 members pioneering the arts of parliamentary diplomacy on a near-universal level. From still another, it is a very large operating mechanism performing such varied